

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

**AUDITORS' REPORT
JUDICIAL SELECTION COMMISSION
FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2001 AND 2002**

**AUDITORS OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
KEVIN P. JOHNSTON ♦ ROBERT G. JAEKLE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
COMMENTS:	2
Foreword.....	2
Résumé of Operations.....	3
CONDITION OF RECORDS	4
Other Matters	4
RECOMMENDATIONS	5
CERTIFICATION	6
CONCLUSION	8

April 17, 2003

**AUDITORS' REPORT
JUDICIAL SELECTION COMMISSION
FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2001 AND 2002**

We have made an examination of the financial records of the Judicial Selection Commission for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2002. This report on that examination consists of the Comments, Condition of Records, and Certification that follow.

Financial statements pertaining to the operations and activities of the Judicial Selection Commission are presented on a Statewide Single Audit basis to include all State agencies. This audit has been limited to assessing the Judicial Selection Commission's compliance with certain provisions of financial related laws and regulations and evaluating the Commission's internal control policies and procedures established to ensure such compliance.

COMMENTS

FOREWORD:

The Judicial Selection Commission (hereafter, the “Commission”) was established under the authority of Article XXV of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State of Connecticut. Additional authority is provided in Section 51-44a of the General Statutes. Section 51-44a provides that the Commission shall seek, evaluate and recommend qualified candidates to the Governor for consideration in nominating new judges. This Section also provides that the Commission evaluate incumbent judges seeking re-nomination to the same court or nomination to a different court. Except for elected judgeships, the judges nominated by the Governor for all State courts are made exclusively from the Commission's approved list.

The Commission maintains a limited staff. The Department of Administrative Services has performed many of the fiscal and administrative duties for the Commission since July 1996.

Commission Members:

Section 51-44a of the General Statutes provides for a Commission of 12 members, two from each congressional district. From each district, one member shall be an attorney and one a non-attorney. No more than six members can be affiliated with the same political party. The Governor is charged with appointing the six attorneys, while the others are appointed by six legislators holding specified leadership positions. Further discussion on Commission membership and appointment authority can be found in the “Condition of Records - Other Matters” section of this report. The Commission members serve staggered three-year terms, and successive terms are prohibited.

As of June 30, 2002, the members of the Commission were as follows:

Hugh F. Keefe, Chair
Shelley M. Rubino, Vice Chairman
John Boyd
Thomas A . Cloutier
Ross H. Garber
James Griffin
Michael J. Morand
Frank Morgan
Francine J. Morris
Dennis J. Riley
William L. Stevens
Michael G. Tansley

During the audited period, Diane S. Yannetta served as Executive Director of the Commission.

RÉSUMÉ OF OPERATIONS:

A comparative summary of Commission expenditures from General Fund appropriations during the audited period and the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000, is presented below:

	Fiscal Year Ended June 30,		
	<u>2001-2002</u>	<u>2000-2001</u>	<u>1999-2000</u>
Personal services	\$72,117	\$67,682	\$57,354
Contractual services	10,147	10,766	21,714
Commodities	11,297	9,029	10,675
Sundry Charges	<u>64</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Expenditures	<u>\$93,625</u>	<u>\$87,802</u>	<u>\$89,743</u>

Personal services costs accounted for 77 percent of expenditures during the two fiscal years under review. An additional \$838 was expended from the Capital Equipment Purchase Fund during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2002.

CONDITION OF RECORDS

Our review of the Judicial Selection Commission for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2002, did not reveal any areas requiring a recommendation. However, one other matter was noted that requires disclosure in our report.

Other Matters:

Connecticut General Statutes Section 51-44a subsection (a), established the Judicial Selection Commission and directed that it be comprised of twelve members with two members appointed from each congressional district.

As a result of population shifts within the United States, the number of congressional districts in Connecticut was reduced from six to five. The Sixth Congressional district ceased to exist at the end of the 2002 session of Congress. As of the commencement of the next session of Congress in January 2003, the composition of the Judicial Selection Commission conflicts with its enabling statute.

The Judicial Selection Commission has twice submitted legislation to correct the inconsistency in its enabling statute. They have proposed that, “two persons shall be appointed on an at-large basis, one of whom shall be an attorney-at-law and one of whom shall not be an attorney-at-law.” To date no corrective legislation has been passed by the legislature.

This matter has been included in the Auditors of Public Account’s, “2002 Annual Report to the Connecticut General Assembly” for corrective action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Status of Prior Audit Recommendations:

- The Judicial Selection Commission should take the necessary steps to ensure that services obtained under Personal Service Agreements are in compliance with statutory requirements. There was no repetition of this condition; therefore, the recommendation will not be repeated.

Current Audit Recommendations:

Our current audit has not revealed any areas that would require a recommendation.

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' CERTIFICATION

As required by Section 2-90 of the General Statutes we have audited the books and accounts of the Judicial Selection Commission for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2002. This audit was primarily limited to performing tests of the Agency's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts, and to understanding and evaluating the effectiveness of the Agency's internal control structure policies and procedures for ensuring that (1) the provisions of certain laws, regulations and contracts applicable to the Agency are complied with, (2) the financial transactions of the Agency are properly recorded, processed, summarized and reported on consistent with management's authorization, and (3) the assets of the Agency are safeguarded against loss or unauthorized use. The financial statement audits of the Judicial Selection Commission for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2002, are included as a part of our Statewide Single Audits of the State of Connecticut for those fiscal years.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and the standards applicable to financial-related audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the Judicial Selection Commission complied in all material or significant respects with the provisions of certain laws, regulations and contracts and to obtain a sufficient understanding of the internal control to plan the audit and determine the nature, timing and extent of tests to be performed during the conduct of the audit.

Compliance:

Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations and contracts applicable to the Judicial Selection Commission is the responsibility of the management of the Judicial Selection Commission.

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Agency complied with laws, regulations, and contracts, noncompliance with which could result in significant unauthorized, illegal, irregular or unsafe transactions or could have a direct and material effect on the results of the Agency's financial operations for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2002, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with these provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*. However, we noted a certain immaterial or less than significant instance of noncompliance, which is described in the accompanying "Condition of Records" section of this report.

Internal Control over Financial Operations, Safeguarding of Assets and Compliance:

The management of the Judicial Selection Commission is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over the Agency's financial operations, safeguarding of assets, and compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations and contracts applicable to the Agency. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the Agency's internal control over its financial operations, safeguarding of assets, and compliance with requirements that could have a material or significant effect on the Agency's financial operations in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of evaluating the Judicial Selection Commission's financial operations, safeguarding of assets, and compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts, and not to provide assurance on the internal control over those control objectives.

Our consideration of the internal control over the Agency's financial operations and over compliance would not necessarily disclose all matters in the internal control that might be material or significant weaknesses. A material or significant weakness is a condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that noncompliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations and contracts or failure to safeguard assets that would be material in relation to the Agency's financial operations or noncompliance which could result in significant unauthorized, illegal, irregular or unsafe transactions to the Agency being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. We noted no matters involving internal control that we consider to be material or significant weaknesses.

This report is intended for the information of the Governor, the State Comptroller, the Appropriations Committee of the General Assembly and the Legislative Committee on Program Review and Investigations. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation and courtesies extended to our representatives by the personnel of the Judicial Selection Commission and the Department of Administrative Services during the course of our examination.

Michael R. Adelson
Associate Auditor

Approved:

Kevin P. Johnston
Auditor of Public Accounts

Robert G. Jaekle
Auditor of Public Accounts

11070-99.RPT